N89-7108-01

INFLUENCE OF POLAR-CAP ALBEDO ON PAST AND CURRENT MARTIAN CLIMATE; Hugh H. Kieffer (U.S Geological Survey, Flagstaff AZ 86001) and David A. Paige (Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena CA 91109)

The bolometric reflectance of the Martian polar caps is a significant term in the annual heat budget of the caps and, in turn, in the current seasonal climate. The albedos of the polar caps were observed by the Viking Orbiters to vary significantly with time and location (1,2): albedos of the two caps differ, but generally increase with insolation intensity. Possible contributing "micromechanisms" include grain growth through metamorphism, floating away or sinking of included dust grains, subsurface sublimation and surface recondensation of CO₂, and surface concentration of frozen H₂O. Although the importance of each of these mechanisms is still uncertain, seasonal-cap models that incorporate the observed albedo variation and the hemispheric difference in polar topography correspond better than other models to the observed annual surface-pressure cycle. Observations by the Mars Observer could distinguish among many of these micromechanisms.

Frost metamorphism is expected to result in grain growth on the order of $100\,\mu\text{m}$ diameter in half a Martian year and would yield a decrease in albedo through the spring and summer. Stokes "floating" is predicted for dust grains of diameters less than $10\,\mu\text{m}$ that reach the cap surface under typical polar summer conditions; this process would yield a constant albedo for dust that initially was uniformly mixed. Radiative transfer in dusty $C0_2$, which includes sinking motion of individual grains relative to the subliming surface (due to their greater absorption of insolation), has been modeled and does demonstrate the observed brightening. This model also predicts subsurface sublimation and surface frost growth due to the smaller extinction coefficient for thermal versus solar wavelengths. The concentration effect of H_20 frost grains depends upon relative grain size, but it is unlikely to be significant because of the similarity between $C0_2$ and H_20 single-scattering albedos. The magnitudes of these micromechanisms will vary in different ways with the astronomical variation of insolation.

The variability of CO₂ frost albedo will be important for long-term climate models; the frost albedo will depend upon the dustiness of the atmosphere, and hence upon the atmospheric surface pressure and dynamics. In models that include both the polar caps and the regolith as volatile reservoirs, the free (atmosphere + cap) volatile inventory depends largely on the soil albedo and the obliquity; however, the surface atmospheric pressure is still controlled by the vapor pressure of a perennial polar cap (3). This mutual dependence of surface pressure, amount of atmospheric dust, frost albedo, and stability of the polar caps make predictions at different obliquities quite uncertain. The variation of obliquity is the dominant term in the astronomical control of Martian climate (4,5); yet, the total range of obliquity is equivalent to an albedo range of 0.65 to 0.88, a range readily accomplished by dusty and clean CO2 frosts. In Martian climate models, polar-frost albedo has commonly been assumed to be constant: this simplifying assumption about a major parameter in the annual volatile cycle brings into question at least the quantitative aspects of such models. An understanding of the processes governing current Martian

Kieffer, H. H. et al.

climate is required before reliable extrapolations can be made to other conditions.

Another challenge for climate models is to distinguish between the effects of the precessional hemispheric asymmetry, which probably controls the season of the dust storms and has a cycle of 50,000 years, and the topographic hemispheric asymmetry, which may influence the global circulation patterns and which perseveres over the astronomical insolation cycles.

References

Kieffer H. H. (1979) J. Geophys. Res., 84, p. 8263-8288.

(2) Paige D. A. (1985) Thesis, California Institute of Technology.

(3) Fanale F. P., Salvail J. R., Banerdt W. B., and Stevens R. S. (1982)

Icarus, 50, p. 381-407

(4) Ward W. R. (1974) J. Geophys. Res., 79, p. 3375-3386.

(5) Ward W. R., Murray B. C., and Malin M. C. (1974) J. Geophys. Res., 79, p. 3387-3410.